**Meeting Notes**

**Dual Credit Workgroup**

Monday July 21, 2014

2:00pm – 4:00pm

ESD 113. 6005 Tyee Dr. SW. Tumwater, WA

**Meeting materials**: [www.wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com](http://www.wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com)

Tim Stetter (phone), Pam LeMay (phone), Joyce Carol (phone), Jeff Charbonneau (phone), Linda Fossen (phone), Randy Spaulding, Marc Webster, Robert Lasker, Rep. Chris Reykdal, Terri Colbert, Jan Yoshiwara, Becky McLean, TJ Kelly, Garrett Havens, Karen Landry, Joyce Hammer, Ben Meredith, Nick Lutes, Noreen Light, Becca Kenna-Schenk, Madeline Thompson, Mike Hubert, Jessica Dempsey, Derek Konshuk, Tyerall Berry, Lucas Rucks, Jim West, Cody Eccles, JoLynn Berge.

1. **Current Models vs. Potential Funding Model Options (chart) were reviewed.**

We discussed documents forwarded to the workgroup describing current models, including charts with cost and percentage scenarios. (see [wiki](http://www.wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com) site)

Comments:

* 1. Statute –We want to clearly define CHS and RS. OSPI is developing rules for CHS. **As we develop a funding model for CHS, hould we create the funding split in rule making instead of in statute?**
  2. Test models were created for the scenarios presented, but should we take those off the table for now and begin with a new idea. The basic premise is this - **we want to start with a world that provides the opportunity for dual credit programs to all students and has no cost to the student.**

1. **Discussion of possible new ways to look at funding dual enrollment programs**
   1. Representative Chris Reykdal suggested the group look at it this way: about $10,000 per year per student is being funded now through various state and local funds for a student in high school. Students are taking AP, IB, CHS in high schools now, RS in high schools and RS at the college. If a student participates in a college level course they should get the credit, without paying. Why would a student who is ambitious need to pay? Currently some students pay (e.g. CHS, RS in colleges for transportation and books) and the legislature wants to clean this up. The decision by the student and parents to participate in one form or other of dual credit/enrollment should be a cost neutral decision.
   2. **We are attempting to put a new model into the current system. But perhaps we need a new system in order to help students**. K-12 and higher education need to work this out. We could start with the Basic Education Allocation (BEA). A few ideas:
      1. K-12 should get 100%, write legislation that the state will pay the colleges for the additional costs to provide the college education. For example, 1 FTE goes to K-12, rest goes to HE.
      2. Colleges could determine the cost for certifying the college teacher, transcripting grades, support for the student and administrators, etc.
      3. K-12 keeps the BEA allotment and levy money too. The more HE students consume, the more goes to the college.
      4. Different revenue streams need to be reflected in our discussion.
      5. The ‘cost center’ changes based on your perception. For example, transportation is a cost to K-12 for college in the HS but it costs the student for RS participation on a college campus. Books are provided in CHS and paid by the HS, but are a cost to students in RS on a college campus. We need to look at equivalent costs and revenues on each side of the equation. OR For example, transportation costs for students in College in the High School is borne by the K-12 system; transportation costs for students in Running Start are borne by the student.
      6. We need to remember that the state saves money down the road when a student participates in dual credit programs.
      7. Put a premium on the RS rate, such as the model used for 2014-15 drop out reengagement, and other programs. Would you keep RS rate for those leaving to college, but have an enhanced rate for CHS?
      8. Enhanced funding for RS/CHS could be linked to enhancements to BEA.
      9. Perhaps create a different split than 93/7%. Move to 90/10 for RS at the college, or some other split to reflect an equitable cost recovery.
      10. What is the additional number for additional college costs for student staying in the HS to take courses? If this is 30% this would probably not get through legislative hurdles, but if 10% it might.
      11. How do we work with tuition in this model, especially if tuition fluctuates in the future?
      12. As an FYI – if the UW sent a bill to the legislature to fund their CHS, this would cost $1.8 million dollars. Explain.
      13. The following chart was created during the discussion, to illustrate the distribution of costs in the two programs:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Running Start | | | College in the High School | | |
|  | Student | Higher Ed | School District | Student | Higher Ed | School District |
| Delivery of Instruction |  | x |  |  |  | x |
| Facilities |  | x |  |  |  | x |
| Transport | x |  |  |  |  | x |
| Books and Supplies | x |  |  |  |  | x |
| Certification |  | x | x |  | x |  |
| Transcript |  | x | x |  | x |  |
| Tuition |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Fees | x |  |  | x |  |  |
| Administration |  | x | x |  | x |  |
| Advising\* |  | x | x |  | X? | x |
| Oversight and prof dev |  | x |  |  | x | x |
| Curriculum dev |  | x |  |  | x |  |

\*blue items were added after the meeting.

1. **Questions and thoughts for future consideration**
   1. There is a value available based on where the student is sitting and additional costs for books, transportation, etc. What assumptions for this do we want to use instead of the FA projections?
   2. We want to reframe our perspective. Determine a dollar enhancement to the current allocation that would be cost recovery for higher education or the high school if the student is running start.
   3. For CHS, split the BEA, start from an enhanced rate, and keep the HS allocation whole. Create an enhanced rate that covers additional costs.
   4. How do we assign volume to these numbers? Do we look at courses instead of students? We need participation numbers from the baccalaureate institutions for CHS, RS in the HS.
   5. Use the same solution for RS. Create the formula in rule instead of statute.
   6. Look at CHS as the RS in the HS model.
2. **Next Steps**
   1. **WSAC will develop options informed by today’s discussion – a proposal for review – and will send to the group. General consensus seems to be that the model should start from an enhanced rate that keeps the HS funding whole, recognizes relative costs and reimburses higher education institutions based on their share of the cost.** The group spent less time addressing student facing costs for Running Start, but a similar approach seemed to be the direction the group was leaning.
   2. The Washington Student Achievement Council will meet on August 21st at UW Tacoma and the dual credit workgroup recommendations will be presented. All present were encouraged to attend.
   3. The group thought a face to face meeting prior to the August 21st Council meeting would be important. It was also noted that agency-requested legislation with budget implications is due on September 19th.
3. **Washington 45**
   1. We briefly reviewed the Washington 45 (a list of courses that transfer to most colleges in Washington and satisfy the general distribution requirements at those colleges).
   2. A list of open textbooks and open course materials compiled by the SBCTC was distributed. These could be used to provide no-cost texts and materials to students in CHS or RS courses.

**Next Meetings:**

* Dual Credit – fiscal subcommittee

Thursday, August 14, 1:00 – 3:00pm

* Dual Credit – full workgroup

Friday, September 26, 12:30-3:30pm

**Both meetings will be held at:**

ESD 113, Pacific room

6005 Tyee Dr. SW

Tumwater, WA

We hope to see you at our next meeting in person, but if that isn’t convenient for you, you may call in. Toll-Free Number: (800) 511-7983, Access Code: 4028173#

**Questions?** Contact Noreen Light, 360.753.7811 or [NoreenL@wsac.wa.gov](mailto:NoreenL@wsac.wa.gov)